

original cosponsor of my colleague Senator SARBANES' bill, the Technology Skills Partnership Act of 1998. I am delighted that Senator SARBANES has taken the initiative in developing this innovative approach to help solve one of the biggest problems this country is facing—an insufficiently skilled workforce. This bill has the bold but achievable goal of trying to change the mindset of U.S. companies in this country in favor of collaborating on training skilled workers for their industry.

We are facing a shortage of skilled workers in this country. Estimates are as high as 190,000 unfilled jobs in the information technology industry alone. But it isn't just the high-tech industry that needs workers with high-tech skills. All industries now need workers with computer literacy, including what we might consider "lower-tech" manufacturing and services such as auto repair shops.

In the long-term, we need to improve our students' education in the math and sciences and attract more students into these areas. Universities need to attract more college students into scientific, engineering, and technical fields. Ultimately, a large part of the responsibility will lie with industry to attract workers into these careers by creating attractive career paths and financial rewards that can compete for the best students.

In the short term, high-tech industry would like to raise H1-B visa caps. But we need to do something more than let foreign workers fill the gap in high-tech workers that now exists. We need to train our workforce with skills that fit industry's needs today. Industry must be a large part of the solution. Only with industry leading the skills training can we be sure that workers are being trained for jobs that actually exist. That is why this bill creates an industry-drive training program.

Why does the federal government need to be involved? Because industry does not normally cooperate in training workers. Small companies, and 90% of firms in the United States are small businesses, don't have the resources to invest in lengthy training. Larger companies used to provide training programs, but in the high-tech field, workers move quickly from one job to another chasing higher salaries. Many companies are reticent to invest in long-term training for employees that may quickly move on. Cooperation within an industry provides a solution to this problem.

The government's role in this bill would be to provide the catalyst to bring the companies together to cooperate on training. The federal funds are matched dollar for dollar by, first, funds from the state and, second, funds from a consortium of 10 or more companies. The federal funds are meant only to start the process—federal funding ends after three years—and then the states and industry continue the cooperative training programs alone.

Let me give you an example from my home state: Connecticut. A recent report prepared by Connecticut's Industry Cluster Advisory Board found that: "... the demand for skilled manufacturing workers far exceeds the number of students graduating from manufacturing programs." There is a "negative perception of manufacturing as a career choice." People "still think of manufacturing as a dirty, low-paying environment with no hope for advancement. Today, manufacturing is clean, and typically a computer-based environment which pays an average annual wage in the \$30,000 range or more with appropriate skills and training."

The report continues:

Substantial investment in training is necessary for companies to compete in this new environment. However, since most precision manufacturing companies are small businesses—of the 750 in the Hartford region only 7.4% have more than 100 employees—companies that are dependent upon their skilled workers for success are not prepared to support worker training.

The report says further:

While Connecticut has a wealth of public technical training resources, these traditional programs cannot meet the current demand fast enough and do not have a direct link from training to employment.

By stimulating industry-led training, we can guarantee a direct link from training to employment that is missing in traditional public sector training programs. In addition, most public sector training programs are focused on unemployed, dislocated, or disadvantaged workers. This program is open to all workers, including incumbent workers who want to improve their skills and increase their opportunities for higher wages and advancement. Further, this program is specifically created to allow participation by small and medium-sized companies.

In the last few years, a small number of regional and industry-based training alliances in the United States have emerged, usually in partnership with state and local governments and technical colleges. In Rhode Island, with help from the state's Human Resource Investment Council, plastics firms developed a skills alliance. The Wisconsin Regional Training Partnership, metal-working firms in conjunction with the AFL-CIO, set up a teaching factory to train workers. While some partnerships have emerged around the country, there are documented difficulties in fostering this kind of collective action without some federal backing. Without some kind of support to create alliances, small- and medium-sized firms just don't have the time or resources to collaborate with anybody on training. In fact, almost all the existing regional skills alliances report that they would not have been able to get off the ground without an independent, staffed entity to operate the alliance. Widespread and timely deployment of these kinds of partnerships is simply not likely to happen without the incentives established by a federal initiative. This can help create successful models and templates that others can replicate across the nation.

I am proud to support the Technology Skills Partnership Act of 1998 and urge my colleagues to join me in taking this step toward an immediate, short-term solution to the shortage of skilled workers in our country.

By Mr. DEWINE (for himself, Mr. HATCH, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. ABRAHAM, and Mr. DASCHLE):

S. 2022. A bill to provide for the improvement of interstate criminal justice identification, information, communications, and forensics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE CRIME IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY ACT OF 1998

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Crime Identification Technology Act of 1998.

More than 20 years of experience working in the criminal justice system have taught me that information is absolutely crucial to successful law enforcement. As a prosecutor in Greene County, Ohio; as Lieutenant Governor overseeing Ohio's anti-crime and anti-drug efforts; and later as a member of the House and Senate Judiciary Committees, I have seen first-hand the importance of information and record-keeping to criminal justice.

Our state and local law enforcement organizations—as well as our courts—need to develop and upgrade their criminal information and identification systems. The Federal Government has already invested billions of dollars in information and identification systems whose benefits will go largely unrealized—unless states receive the resources to be able to participate in these systems. Our national data bases are only as good as the information in which the states provide by their participation.

Unfortunately, there is still a wide disparity between the criminal identification systems that are available—and the ability of state and local law enforcement to develop and use them. For example, while computer technology exists that allows law enforcement to match fingerprints electronically with criminal history databases, most states lack the equipment and resources necessary to connect on any broad scale with the databases operated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI).

Too many States lack the resources to contribute state criminal histories to the FBI criminal history database in a timely manner or in a computer-ready format, and have inadequate equipment to retrieve information from the database quickly or on a widespread geographic basis.

While we may disagree about the Brady Act, it funded the National Criminal History Improvement Program (N-CHIP), administered by the Bureau of Justice Statistics, which has successfully helped states prepare to perform background checks. Unfortunately, N-CHIP expires this year—but not all states are fully operational.

In addition, the FBI, the National Criminal Center (NCIC) 2000, and the Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System will be fully operational—and ready for states to participate—soon.

Also, DNA casework testing has more than doubled in the last three years because of demand by law enforcement to provide DNA analysis in violent crime cases. In 48 states convicted offender DNA analysis is mandated by statute. Further, advances in the use of DNA to solve crimes based on automated searches of State and National CODIS DNA profile databases are producing DNA matches, generating even more demand for rapid testing of convicted felon DNA samples for database input. The demand for casework results and the need for convicted offender database analysis continues to grow at a rate that outstrips the capacities and capabilities of state and local crime laboratories.

We need to make sure the states are able to make the fullest possible use of this breathtaking technology.

That's the idea behind the bill I am introducing today. It would provide \$250 million in each of the next five years for grants to the states. The Attorney General, through the Bureau of Justice Statistics, is directed to make grants to each state to be used in conjunction with units of local government, and other states, to develop, update, or upgrade technologies, including the following:

Centralized, automated criminal history record information systems, including arrest and disposition reporting.

Automated fingerprint identification systems that are compatible with the Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System (IAFIS) of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Fingerprint imaging, live scan and other automated systems to digitize fingerprints and to communicate prints in a manner that is compatible with systems operated by states and the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Systems to facilitate full participation in the Interstate Identification Index (III).

Programs and systems to facilitate full participation in the Interstate Identification Index National Crime Prevention and Privacy Compact.

Systems to facilitate full participation in the National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS) for firearms eligibility determinations.

Integrated criminal justice information systems to manage and communicate criminal justice information among law enforcement, courts, prosecution, and corrections.

Court-based criminal justice information systems to promote reporting of dispositions to central state repositories and to the FBI, and to promote the integration of court systems with other criminal justice information systems.

Ballistics identification programs that are compatible—and integrated—

with the National Integrated Ballistics Network (NIBN).

Information, identification and communications programs for forensic purposes, including for crime laboratory accreditation.

DNA programs for forensic and identification purposes.

Sexual offender identification and registration systems.

Domestic violence offender identification and information systems.

Criminal justice information systems with a capacity to provide statistical and research products including incident-based reporting systems and uniform crime reports.

Online and other state-of-the-art communications technologies and programs.

Mr. President, all these proposals have one thing on common: they are based on the principle that technology is the future of police work. It is the number one edge our law enforcement officers are going to have in the struggle against criminals, well into the 21st century. In this sense, crime-fighting is a lot like baseball. It's a game of percentages—and everything we can do to boost the average helps the team.

We can continue to pursue increasingly sophisticated criminals with outmoded twentieth century technology—or we can substantially boost our team's average by providing states the Federal assistance required to effectively participate in these programs. If we are serious about reducing crime in America, the Federal Government has to step up to the plate on this key issue of promoting state and local use of available crime-fighting technology.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2022

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Crime Identification Technology Act of 1998".

SEC. 2. STATE GRANT PROGRAM FOR CRIMINAL JUSTICE IDENTIFICATION, INFORMATION, AND COMMUNICATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the availability of amounts provided in advance in appropriations Acts, the Attorney General, through the Bureau of Justice Statistics of the Department of Justice, shall make a grant to each State, which shall be used by the State, in conjunction with units of local government, State and local courts, other States, or combinations thereof, to establish or upgrade an integrated approach to develop information and identification technologies and systems to—

(1) upgrade criminal history and criminal justice record systems, including systems operated by law enforcement agencies and courts;

(2) improve criminal justice identification;

(3) promote compatibility and integration of national, State, and local systems for—

(A) criminal justice purposes;

(B) firearms eligibility determinations;

(C) identification of sexual offenders;

(D) identification of domestic violence offenders; and

(E) background checks for other authorized purposes unrelated to criminal justice; and

(4) capture information for statistical and research purposes to improve the administration of criminal justice.

(b) USE OF GRANT AMOUNTS.—Grants under this section may be used for programs to establish, develop, update, or upgrade—

(1) State centralized, automated, adult and juvenile criminal history record information systems, including arrest and disposition reporting;

(2) automated fingerprint identification systems that are compatible with standards established by the National Institute of Standards and Technology and interoperable with the Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System (IAFIS) of the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

(3) finger imaging, live scan, and other automated systems to digitize fingerprints and to communicate prints in a manner that is compatible with standards established by the National Institute of Standards and Technology and interoperable with systems operated by States and by the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

(4) programs and systems to facilitate full participation in the Interstate Identification Index of the National Crime Information Center;

(5) systems to facilitate full participation in any compact relating to the Interstate Identification Index of the National Crime Information Center;

(6) systems to facilitate full participation in the national instant criminal background check system established under section 103(b) of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act (18 U.S.C. 922 note) for firearms eligibility determinations;

(7) integrated criminal justice information systems to manage and communicate criminal justice information among law enforcement agencies, courts, prosecutors, and corrections agencies;

(8) noncriminal history record information systems relevant to firearms eligibility determinations for availability and accessibility to the national instant criminal background check system established under section 103(b) of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act (18 U.S.C. 922 note);

(9) court-based criminal justice information systems that promote—

(A) reporting of dispositions to central State repositories and to the Federal Bureau of Investigation; and

(B) compatibility with, and integration of, court systems with other criminal justice information systems;

(10) ballistics identification and information programs that are compatible and integrated with the National Integrated Ballistics Network (NIBN);

(11) DNA programs for forensic and identification purposes, and identification and information programs to improve forensic analysis and to assist in accrediting crime laboratories;

(12) sexual offender identification and registration systems;

(13) domestic violence offender identification and information systems;

(14) programs for fingerprint-supported background checks capability for non-criminal justice purposes, including youth service employees and volunteers and other individuals in positions of responsibility, if authorized by Federal or State law and administered by a government agency;

(15) criminal justice information systems with a capacity to provide statistical and research products including incident-based reporting systems that are compatible with

the National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS) and uniform crime reports; and (16) multiagency, multijurisdictional communications systems among the States to share routine and emergency information among Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies.

(c) ASSURANCES.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, a State shall provide assurances to the Attorney General that the State has the capability to contribute pertinent information to the national instant criminal background check system established under section 103(b) of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act (18 U.S.C. 922 note).

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$250,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

(2) LIMITATIONS.—Of the amount made available to carry out this section in any fiscal year—

(A) not more than 3 percent may be used by the Attorney General for salaries and administrative expenses;

(B) not more than 5 percent may be used for technical assistance, training and evaluations, and studies commissioned by Bureau of Justice Statistics of the Department of Justice (through discretionary grants or otherwise) in furtherance of the purposes of this section; and

(C) the Attorney General shall ensure the amounts are distributed on an equitable geographic basis.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am proud to join Senator DEWINE in introducing legislation to authorize comprehensive Department of Justice grants to every state for criminal justice identification, information and communications technologies and systems. I applaud the Senator from Ohio for his leadership. I am also pleased that the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee and the Democratic Leader are original cosponsors of this bipartisan legislation.

I know from my experience in law enforcement in Vermont over the last 30 years that access to quality, accurate information in a timely fashion is of vital importance. As we prepare to enter the 21st Century, we must provide our state and local law enforcement officers with the resources to develop the latest technological tools and communications systems to solve and prevent crime. I believe this bill accomplishes that goal.

Our bipartisan legislation authorizes \$250 million for each of the next five years in grants to states for crime information and identification systems. The Attorney General, through the Bureau of Justice Statistics, is directed to make grants to each state to be used in conjunction with units of local government, and other states, to use information and identification technologies and systems to upgrade criminal history and criminal justice record systems.

Grants made under our legislation may include programs to establish, develop, update or upgrade—

State, centralized, automated criminal history record information systems, including arrest and disposition reporting.

Automated fingerprint identification systems that are compatible with the Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System (IAFIS) of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Finger imaging, live scan and other automated systems to digitize fingerprints and to communicate prints in a manner that is compatible with systems operated by states and the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Systems to facilitate full participation in the Interstate Identification Index (III).

Programs and systems to facilitate full participation in the Interstate Identification Index National Crime Prevention and Privacy Compact.

Systems to facilitate full participation in the National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS) for firearms eligibility determinations.

Integrated criminal justice information systems to manage and communicate criminal justice information among law enforcement, courts, prosecution, and corrections.

Non-criminal history record information systems relevant to firearms eligibility determinations for availability and accessibility to the NICS.

Court-based criminal justice information systems to promote reporting of dispositions to central state repositories and to the FBI and to promote the compatibility with, and integration of, court systems with other criminal justice information systems.

Ballistics identification programs that are compatible and integrated with the ballistics programs of the National Integrated Ballistics Network (NIBN).

Information, identification and communications programs for forensic purposes.

DNA programs for forensic and identification purposes.

Sexual offender identification and registration systems.

Domestic violence offender identification and information systems

Programs for fingerprint-supported background checks for non-criminal justice purposes including youth service employees and volunteers and other individuals in positions of trust, if authorized by federal or state law and administered by a government agency.

Criminal justice information systems with a capacity to provide statistical and research products including incident-based reporting systems and uniform crime reports.

Online and other state-of-the-art communications technologies and programs.

Multi-agency, multi-jurisdictional communications systems to share routine and emergency information among federal, state and local law enforcement agencies.

Let me just give a couple of examples from my home State of Vermont that illustrate how our comprehensive legislation will aid state and local law enforcement agencies across the country.

The future of law enforcement must focus on working together to harness

the power of today's information age to prevent crime and catch criminals. One way to work together is for state and local law enforcement agencies to band together to create efficiencies of scale. For example, together with New Hampshire and Maine, the State of Vermont has pooled its resources together to build a tri-state IAFIS system to identify fingerprints. Our bipartisan legislation would foster these partnerships by allowing groups of States to apply together for grants.

Another challenge for law enforcement agencies across the country is communication difficulties between federal, state and local law enforcement officials. In a recent report, the Department of Justice's National Institute of Justice concluded that law enforcement agencies throughout the nation lack adequate communications systems to respond to crimes that cross state and local jurisdictions.

A 1997 incident along the Vermont and New Hampshire border underscored this problem. During a cross border shooting spree that left four people dead including two New Hampshire state troopers, Vermont and New Hampshire officers were forced to park two police cruisers next to one another to coordinate activities between federal, state and local law enforcement officers because the two states' police radios could not communicate with one another.

The Vermont Department of Public Safety, the Vermont U.S. Attorney's Office and others have reacted to this communications problem by developing the Northern Lights proposal. This project will allow the northern borders States of Vermont, New York, New Hampshire and Maine to integrate their law enforcement communications systems to better coordinate interdiction efforts and share intelligence data seamlessly.

Our legislation would provide grants for the development of integrated Federal, State and local law enforcement communications systems to foster cutting edge efforts like the Northern Lights project.

In addition, our bipartisan legislation will help each of our States meet its obligations under national anti-crime initiatives. For instance, the FBI will soon bring online NCIC 2000 and IAFIS which will require states to update their criminal justice systems for the country to benefit. States are also being asked to participate in several other national programs such as sexual offender registries, national domestic violence legislation, Brady Act, and National Child Protection Act.

Currently, there are no comprehensive programs to support these national crime-fighting systems. Our legislation will fill this void by helping the each State meet its obligations under these Federal laws.

Our bipartisan legislation provides a helping hand with the heavy hand of a

top-down, Washington-knows-best approach. Unfortunately, some in Congress have pushed legislation mandating minute detail changes that States must make in their laws to qualify for Federal funds. Our bill rejects this approach. Instead, we provide the States with Federal support to improve their criminal justice identification, information and communication systems without prescribing new Federal mandates.

Mr. President, we have patterned the administration of the technology grants under our bill after the highly successful DOJ National Criminal History Improvement Program (N-CHIP), which was created by the 1993 Brady Act.

The Vermont Department of Public Safety has received funds under the N-CHIP program for the past three years and I have been proud to strongly support their efforts. With that Federal assistance, Vermont has been achieved acquiring the automated fingerprint identification system in conjunction with Maine and New Hampshire, upgrading its records repository computer systems, as well as extending their online incident-based reporting system to local jurisdictions throughout Vermont. Our bill builds on the Justice Department's existing infrastructure under the successful N-CHIP program to provide fair and effective grant administration.

I know that the Justice Department, under Attorney General Reno's leadership, has made it a priority to modernize and automate criminal history records. Our legislation will continue that leadership by providing each State with the necessary resources to continue to make important efforts to bring their criminal justice systems up to date.

I urge my colleagues to support our bipartisan bill to provide each State with the resources to capture the power of emerging information and communications technologies to serve and protect all of our citizens.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, law enforcement agencies in every state rely increasingly on criminal history record information. Suspected criminals cross state lines and move between communities, creating an unprecedented need for greater cooperation between the 50 states and between states and the federal government to share this information. It is imperative that each state be able to take advantage of emerging technologies that make this cooperation possible. It is for that reason that I am pleased to cosponsor the State Grant Program for Criminal Justice Identification, Information and Communication. This legislation will help states upgrade their criminal justice information and identification operations, assist in integrating those operations, and make those operations compatible with the FBI's communication technology.

Revolutionary technological improvements in communication systems

allow localities separated by great distances to share information instantaneously. This communication between law enforcement agencies can make the difference between locating suspects and getting them off the streets, or leaving them free to commit more crimes. I believe we have a responsibility to ensure that states have full access to new criminal history record technologies. This legislation will provide the federal financial assistance and leadership that the states need by establishing a \$1.25 billion, 5-year, comprehensive federal assistance program to provide grants to every state for criminal justice identification, information and communications technologies and systems.

In addition, grants provided under this legislation will assist states as they upgrade their fingerprint and other identification technologies so that they are compatible with the Federal Bureau of Investigation's (FBI) criminal history record information systems. The FBI will soon implement 2 major information and identification initiatives, the Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System (IAFIS) and NCIC 2000, that could dramatically improve the access law enforcement agencies have to criminal history record information. IAFIS, in particular, will greatly enhance the exchange of information between the FBI and the states, providing rapid electronic submission and transfer of fingerprint and criminal history information. The states will need the funding assistance provided by this legislation to obtain the equipment necessary to derive full benefit from these new systems.

In recent years, Congress has recognized the urgent need to secure the safety of our streets for our children and our families, and this has led to the enactment of federal initiatives, such as sexual offender registries, domestic violence initiatives, the National Child Protection Act, and the Brady National Instant Background Check System. Although these initiatives have done a great deal to protect adults and children in communities nationwide, additional steps need to be taken. The State Grant Program for Criminal Justice Identification, Information and Communication will provide assistance to states so they can take that next step.

Criminal tracking programs have been far more effective in identifying and apprehending dangerous criminals than any other programs in recent memory, but we have an opportunity to make these tracking programs much more effective. As technology continues to improve this country's communication systems, we must make sure the states are not left behind. If the states cannot access these systems, or do not have the funding to obtain them, then this revolutionary technology will be of little help. By enacting the State Grant Program for Criminal Justice Identification, Information

and Communication, we have the opportunity to improve the cooperation between law enforcement agencies nationwide. This will be instrumental in getting criminals off the streets and away from our children, and I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this bill.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 472

At the request of Mr. CRAIG, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 472, a bill to provide for referenda in which the residents of Puerto Rico may express democratically their preferences regarding the political status of the territory, and for other purposes.

S. 885

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 885, a bill to amend the Electronic Fund Transfer Act to limit fees charged by financial institutions for the use of automatic teller machines, and for other purposes.

S. 981

At the request of Mr. THOMPSON, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 981, a bill to provide for analysis of major rules.

S. 1220

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1220, a bill to provide a process for declassifying on an expedited basis certain documents relating to human rights abuses in Guatemala and Honduras.

S. 1252

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1252, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the amount of low-income housing credits which may be allocated in each State, and to index such amount for inflation.

S. 1291

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1291, a bill to permit the interstate distribution of State-inspected meat under certain circumstances.

S. 1321

At the request of Mr. TORRICELLI, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1321, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to permit grants for the national estuary program to be used for the development and implementation of a comprehensive conservation and management plan, to reauthorize appropriations to carry out the program, and for other purposes.

S. 1365

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S.